

**Sandt & Associates**  
900 Deerfield Court  
Midland, MI 48640  
(E-mail: billsandt@chartermi.net)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 06 2007

# Fax

Date	8-4-2007		
To:	M. Lyle Alexander Group Art Unit 1743	From:	B.W. Sandt
cc		Phone	(989) 631-6852
Fax:	571-273 8300	Fax	(989) 835-6030
Phone:		Pages:	3
Re:	Application SN 11/349,390		

**Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle**

Unless otherwise indicated, or obvious from the nature of this transmittal, the information contained in this Fax is **Confidential**, intended for the use of only the person or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, he is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If this message has been received in error, please immediately notify sender and destroy all copies and return the original copy to the sender at sender's expense.

## Message

Applicant: Jin Po Lee  
Serial No.: 10/019,570  
Filed: 11/08/2001  
For: Multiple Analyte Assay Device  
Group Art Unit: 1743 Examiner: Lyle A. Alexander

Attached please find a response to the Office Action of 7/11/2007

  
Bernd W. Sandt

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Jin Po Lee

Serial No: 10/019,570

Filed: 11/8/2001

For: Multiple Analyte Assay Device

Group Art Unit: 1743.

Examiner: L. A. Alexander

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 06 2007**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE C**

Sir:

The applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview courteously granted on August 2, 2007. The interview discussed the Office Action of July 11, 2007, and is believed to have clarified the status of the art and the pending claims.

It is noted that the applicant misstated the claim number 26 instead of 35 in the section headed "New claims". However the claim number was correctly stated in the "Claim Status" section and in the response, so that no further correction is deemed necessary.

The examiner had raised the definiteness of the term "housing" as used in the claims as the basis for a 35 USC 112 rejection. It is submitted that the term housing is adequately defined on page 9, lines 2-3, as comprising the base (101) and the cover (110). As Figure 2 of the drawings show the cover and the base are coextensive. Applicant's limitation (D) specifically defines the housing as constituting the base and the coextensive cover. It is submitted that the claims adequately define the housing as supported by the specification. The rejection is hence traversed.

- 1 -

SN10/019570  
BWS 05-01